

Remarks

Claims 1 and 42 have been amended without prejudice to the filing of continuing applications. All the amendments are supported by the original claims and specification.


The amended claims are all now within the scope of the elected invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended as outlined by the Examiner on page 2 of the Action. Claim 1 has also been amended in line 3 of the claim and claim 42 has been amended to improve its grammar. No new matter is added herein.

Method of use claims 46, 49, and 50 currently stand withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions. However, in accordance with MPEP §821.04(b), if Applicants elect claims directed to a product which is subsequently found allowable, the withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. Upon rejoinder of claims directed to a previously non-elected process invention, the restriction requirement between the elected product and rejoined process claims will be withdrawn. It is submitted that the method claims as presented require all the limitations of the elected product (compound) claims. Thus, if the product claims are found allowable, the non-elected process claims (withdrawn) should be rejoined.

Should the Examiner believe that a discussion of this matter would be helpful, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Steven J. Sarussi
Reg. No. 32,784

Dated: June 27, 2006

McDONNELL BOEHNEN,
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 913-0001